DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 376 245 UD 030 154

AUTHOR Fuller, Edward J.
TITLE Trust as the Basis for Urban School Reform and as an Explanation of the Variability in Involuntary Minority Academic Achievement.
PUB DATE Apr 94
NOTE 35p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (New Orleans, LA, April 4-8, 1994).
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Achievement; Causal Models; *Educational Change; Elementary Secondary Education; *Immigrants; *Minority Groups; *Trust (Psychology); *Urban Schools
IDENTIFIERS *Involuntary Minorities; *Reform Efforts

ABSTRACT

In studying the disparity of academic achievement between minority and nonminority students, anthropologists and educators have identified a distinct variability in the academic success between two discrete subgroups within the minority school population: those who have voluntarily emigrated from their original societies and those who have involuntarily become members of a particular society because of slavery, conquest, or colonization. In the United States involuntary minorities primarily include African Americans, Native Americans, and many Hispanic Americans. An overview of involuntary-minority academic success and failure is followed by an alternative explanation based on the ability of the local school to institute measures that develop a sense of trust, or at least an abeyance of mistrust, in the school and school authorities. Some strategies are proposed to develop the necessary sense of trust. (Contains 46 references.) (SLD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED376245

Trust as the Basis for Urban School Reform and as an Explanation of the Variability in Involuntary Minority Academic Achievement

Paper presented at the
1994
American Educational Research Association
Annual Meeting

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
E. J. Fuller
Univ. Texas-Austin
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Edward J. Fuller
Department of Educational Administration
EDB 310
The University of Texas at Austin
Austin, TX 78712-1291

CE030154

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Since the early years of the twentieth century, significant concerns have existed about the academic and social problems encountered by minority students in the schooling process (Ogbu, 1991; Tyack, 1974). These concerns have, once again, become a prominent issue among many academics, educators, and other citizens as the result of a multitude of demographic studies indicating that the student population in the United States is becoming increasingly minority in nature. In studying the ubiquitous disparity in academic achievement between minority and non-minority students over the past decades, however, anthropologists and educators have identified a distinct variability in the academic success between two discrete subgroups within the minority school population: the first subpopulation consists of those minority groups which have *voluntarily* emigrated from their original society to a different society, while the second subpopulation consists of those minority groups which, because of slavery, conquest, or colonization, did not *voluntarily* choose to become members of a particular society (Ogbu, 1991). Within the United States, the first subpopulation, described as *voluntary* minorities, would consist of groups such as Europeans, Central and South Americans, and Asians. The second subpopulation, described as *involuntary* minorities, would include primarily African Americans, Native Americans, and many Hispanic Americans.[1] A large and growing body of research has documented that *voluntary* minority students tend to academically outperform their *involuntary* minority counterparts in a number of different settings, including in the United States, (Ogbu, 1991).

Much of this variability in the academic performance between *voluntary* and *involuntary* minority students can be attributed to, according to Ogbu (1987), the differing

---

[1] Hispanic Americans of Mexican descent present a special case. A large portion of Mexico was conquered by the United States, thus dividing the country and its people. Descendants of Mexicans who lived in the conquered area are considered *involuntary* minorities. Alternatively, descendants of Mexicans who lived in Mexico and have emigrated to the United States are considered *voluntary* minorities.

orientations between the two groups toward the prejudice and discrimination suffered by all minority citizens at the hands of the dominant Anglo society. According to Ogbu (1991), *voluntary* minorities tend to (1) see the societal barriers erected by the dominant society against them as temporary, (2) have a "dual frame of reference" with respect to their homeland and their new country which allows them to develop or maintain an optimistic view of their future possibilities, (3) attribute their exclusion from better jobs to their foreign status and/or their inability to fluently speak the native language, (4) retain a sense of cultural identity which was developed prior to immigration, and (5) possess a relatively large degree of *trust* in the institutions controlled by the dominant society. Alternatively, Ogbu (1991) suggested that *involuntary* minorities (1) see the societal barriers erected by the dominant society against them as permanent, (2) have no "dual frame of reference" to assist them in developing an optimistic view of their future possibilities, (3) attribute their exclusion from good jobs to the institutionalized discrimination of the dominant society, (4) have little or no sense of cultural identity with any homeland peoples but develop a culture in opposition to the dominant group's culture, and (5) possess a relatively small degree of *trust* or even *distrust* in the dominant society's institutions. With respect to schooling, this difference in orientation results in *voluntary* minority students exhibiting a greater degree of academic effort, and consequently, attaining a greater degree of academic success, than *involuntary* minority students. In other words, since *voluntary* minority students and parents possess a greater belief than *involuntary* minority students and parents that hard work and academic success will result in a decrease in the discriminatory and prejudicial barriers enacted against them, *voluntary* minority students work harder and, therefore, exhibit greater academic achievement than do *involuntary* minority students.

Since the introduction of Ogbu's cultural-ecological theory of the variabilty in academic success between *voluntary* and *involuntary* minority students, it has received both empirioal and anthropological support (Erickson, 1987). Subsequent to the

identification and adequate explanation of the variability between *voluntary* and *involuntary* minority students academic achievement, the variability in academic achievement within the *involuntary* minority student population has become increasingly evident. For example, *involuntary* minority students in a number of different individual school sites across the country have shown significant increases in academic achievement while *involuntary* minority students in the majority of schools continue to academically underachieve in comparison to their Anglo peers. The salient question, then, is why do some predominately *involuntary* minority schools perform quite well academically while other predominately *involuntary* minority schools do not ?

In this article, I will provide a brief overview of the past and present explanations of *involuntary* minority academic success and failure, then argue that the presently accepted sociolinguistic and cultural-ecological theories do not adequately explain the variability in *involuntary* minority academic success. I will, subsequently, propose an alternative explanation of *involuntary* minority academic success and failure based on the ability of the local school to institute measures which develop a sense of trust --or at least an abeyance of distrust--in the school and school authority held by *involuntary* minority students, parents, and community. Using the posited explanation as a basis for discussion, I will then proceed to describe how current educational practices at the local school site contribute to *involuntary* minority academic failure through the development of *involuntary* minority distrust of the school. Within this discussion, I will also propose some strategies which schools can employ to increase achievement of *involuntary* minority students by developing a sense of trust in the school within the *involuntary* minority community.

Explanations of Involuntary Minority Low Achievement

Over the last three decades, a variety of explanations have been posited for the low academic achievement of involuntary minority students. In the mid-1960s, educators and social scientists attempted to refute the theory of genetic racial differences by introducing

the "cultural deprivation" theory to explain low involuntary minority school achievement (Ravitch, 1983). This explanation postulated that poor, involuntary minority children's home experiences deprived them of the cultural patterns necessary for school success (Ravitch, 1983).

In the late 1960s, some of those embracing the cultural deprivation theory proposed an alternative, although somewhat similar theory. Their new sociolinguistic perspective suggested involuntary minority school failure could be explained by the discontinuity in language patterns, behaviors, and cultural preferences between involuntary minority students and non-minority teachers and administrators (Erickson, 1987; Villegas, 1988). This perspective, which is still advanced by scholars today, proposes that the differences in language use, behavior, and preferences due to the cultural differences between the involuntary minority student and the Anglo teacher creates problems in teaching and learning which lead to low achievement by involuntary minorities.

In the mid-1970s, Ogbu began to criticize the sociolinguistic perspective on involuntary minority school failure. He postulated the causes of involuntary minority academic underachievement did not fully reside in either the individual home experience of a student or in the school. Instead, his cultural-ecological theory located the primary source of involuntary minority school failure within the broader society in which schools operate and within the involuntary minority community itself (Ogbu, 1992). According to Ogbu (1991), the societal barriers erected by the dominant Anglo society to deny societal and economic advancement by involuntary minorities leads to the belief by involuntary minority community members that the dominant Anglo society and its institutions cannot be trusted. With respect to schooling, the societal barriers instigate a belief within the involuntary minority community that school success does not lead to societal or economic advancement. Many involuntary minority students, subsequently, do not view education as beneficial to their lives. These students, thus, reject schooling and even develop an

oppositional orientation and culture toward the educational system in general and the individual school in particular (Ogbu, 1991; Fordham and Ogbu, 1979).

Although the sociolinguistic and cultural-ecological perspectives on involuntary minority school failure are both substantiated by anthropological and empirical evidence (Erickson, 1987), neither perspective can fully explain the variability in *involuntary* minority achievement. Erickson (1987) indicates the only involuntary minority academic achievement the sociolinguistic perspective can account for is that which occurs in schools utilizing culturally relevant pedagogy. For example, Erickson (1987) notes that the academic success achieved by involuntary minority students in Black Muslim, Catholic parochial, and other individual schools not utilizing culturally relevant pedagogy cannot be explained by the sociolinguistic perspective. The cultural-ecological perspective, on the other hand, can explain voluntary minority success, but is unable to account for the occurrence of any involuntary minority academic achievement (Erickson, 1987). For example, the cultural-ecological perspective would be unable to explain a significant difference in the academic achievement between two neighboring schools with comparable involuntary minority enrollments because the students from both the schools would be under the influence of the same labor market perception, roughly the same involuntary minority community attitudes towards education, and approximately the same orientation towards the discriminatory and prejudicial societal barriers erected against them. The cultural-ecological perspective, thus, would be unable to explain the academic success of the involuntary minority students in Levin's Accelerated Schools, Slavin's Success for All programs, Sizer's Essential Schools, Comer schools, and the other academically successful schools of involuntary minority students. Because of the inability of either perspective to fully explain the variability in involuntary minority achievement, a perspective capable of explaining all instances of involuntary minority school achievement is needed.

Trust as a Critical Variable in Involuntary Minority Academic Success

Trust, as defined the American Heritage Dictionary (1982, p.1300), is "the confidence in the integrity, ability, character, and truth of a person or thing." A school, then, would be considered trustworthy if it warrants the students and parents' confidence in the integrity, ability, character, and truth of the school and school authority. As I argue in this essay, it is the ability of the school to properly and effectively educate the community's children--according to the community's pespective of what is "proper" and "effective"--which determines the level of confidence, and therefore trust, in the school and the school authority. If a school is perceived as trustworthy and legitimate by students and parents, then Erickson (1987) proposes that the students and parents will assent to the exercise of authority by the school. Since one form of political assent is learning (Erickson, 1987), the conclusion can tentatively be drawn that the trust held by the community in the school--especially in the school's ability to educate the community's children--is critical to the academic achievement of the students within that particular community. In other words, the trustworthiness of the school in the eyes of the community is a, if not the, determining factor in the academic success of the community's children. In fact, Erickson (1987; p.31) makes this same conclusion in professing that, "the politics of trust, legitimacy, and assent seem to be the most fundamental factors in school success."

On the other hand, if parents and students do not perceive the school as trustworthy, then students would be unlikely to assent to the exercise of authority. Consequently, little, if any, significant academic learning would occur. Ogbu (1991) reached this same conclusion in his studies of the education of minorities. He observed that, within the involuntary minority community, there exists an underlying *mistrust* of the dominant Anglo society and the school systems which it controls. Such mistrust, according to Ogbu (1991), simply compounds the difficulties involuntary minority students already encounter in school. He further observes:

> Since involuntary minorities do not *trust* the school and those who control the schools, they are usually skeptical about the schools' ability to educate their children. This skepticism is communicated through family and community discussions and gossip, as well as through public debates over minority education. Another factor discouraging academic effort is that involuntary minorities--parents and students alike--tend to question school rules of behavior and standard practices, rather than accept and follow them as the immigrants appear to do. Indeed, involuntary minorities sometimes interpret the school rules and standard practices as an imposition of the dominant group members frame of cultural reference, which does not necessarily meet their educational needs . . . under these circumstances, it is probably difficult for children of involuntary minorities, especially the older ones, to accept and follow the school rules of behavior and to persevere at their academic tasks. (Ogbu, 1987, p.28; emphasis added)

The distrust, therefore, of involuntary minority parents and students of the school and school staff is a serious obstacle to the academic achievement of involuntary minority students which both the school and involuntary minority community must jointly work to overcome. Without the development of a mutually trusting relationship between the involuntary minority community and the school, involuntary minority parents and students will continue to be alienated from the school (Comer, 1988), and involuntary minority students will continue to underachieve in comparison to their Anglo peers. To ameliorate the problem of mistrust between parents and students and the school and school staff, Erickson (1987, p. 15) proposes that parents and students must, "trust in the legitimacy of the authority [of the school], and in the good intentions of those exercising it, trust that one's own identity will be maintained positively in relation to the authority, and trust that one's own interests will be advanced in compliance with the exercise of authority."

It is extremely important to note, however, that it is *not* the responsibilty of the involuntary minority community to blindly place trust in the school and the school staff. Indeed, given the lengthy history of the failure of schools in the United States of America to meet the needs and wants of involuntary minorities, it would be naive and foolish to believe that the simple placing of trust in the local school site by involuntary minority communities, parents, and students will change the academic achievement by involuntary minority students. In contrast, I am arguing that the school and school staff must develop

and initiate programs, policies, and procedures which will justify a sense of confidence within the involuntary minority community in the integrity, ability, character, and truth of the individual school site. Once schools initiate legitimate and public efforts to meet the unique educational, social, and cultural needs of involuntary minority students, the involuntary minority community will be more likely to suspend their distrust of the school as an institution and to begin to develop a sense of trust in the school and the authority of the school. As Erickson (1987) compellingly argues, such a scenario allows effective teaching and learning to occur. Building upon Erickson's argument, I argue that the development of trust within the involuntary minority community for the local school site--based on the honest, legitimate, and public efforts of the local school to meet the needs of the involuntary minority students--is a necessary condition for the academic achievement of involuntary minority students. The concept of trust is, therefore, in my opinion, a plausible explanation of the variability in the involuntary minority academic achievement within the United States of America.

Not only does the explanation of trust as a critical variable in the academic success or failure of involuntary minority students appear creditable, such an explanation can also incorporate both the sociolinguistic and cultural-ecological perspectives. With regard to the sociolinguistic explanation of involuntary minority school failure, the linguistic and behavioral cultural discontinuities between the home and school can be viewed as causing a lack of trust within the involuntary minority community that the students' cultural and ethnic identities will be maintained. As will be argued later, the decision to not address the sociolinguistic discontinuity between home and school is tantamount to attempting to recast the involuntary minority student into a middle-class Anglo student. Obviously, such an attempt to recast involuntary minority students into middle-class Anglo students does not affirm students' sense of cultural and ethnic identity, but only serves to undermine it. Alternatively, if the school and school staff bridge the cultural discontinuities between the home and school, then the involuntary minority students and parents will view the school

and school staff as maintaining and affirming the students' sense of cultural and ethnic identity. The involuntary minority students and parents, consequently, will place trust in the school and school staff and be more likely to believe in the school's ability to educate their children. This belief will likely lead to an increase in academic achievement by the involuntary minority students.

With regard to the cultural-ecological perspective, the erection of societal barriers to involuntary minority economic advancement can be viewed as causing a lack of trust within the involuntary minority community that the interests of involuntary minority students will be advanced by compliance to the authority of the school. In other words, if involuntary minority students and parents see the discriminatory and prejudicial societal barriers within and without the educational setting as inhibiting the ability of involuntary minority to "get ahead" or "fulfill their potential", then involuntary minority students simply will not trust that compliance to the authority of the school--namely, follow the rules and work hard--will result in any positive gains for themselves over the long run. Alternatively, if the school can somehow enact policies and programs which justify a sense of trust within the involuntary minority students and parents that consenting to the authority of the school will result in tangible gains for the students in the long run, then the involuntary minority students would be more likely to achieve academic success.

More importantly, however, this framework of trust focuses on explaining the academic *success* of entire groups of involuntary minority students at individual school sites whereas both the socio-linguistic and cultural-ecological perspectives focus primarily on explaining involuntary minority academic *failure*. The explanation of trust, then, can account for the variability in involuntary minority academic achievement which cannot be explained by either the sociolinguistic or cultural-ecological perspectives. For example, the academic success of involuntary minority students in parochial and other private schools which do not utilize culturally relevant pedagogy, and thus cannot be explained by the socio-linguistic perspective, can be explained on the basis of the development and

communication of a sense of trust. By choosing to remove their children from the public schools and enrolling them in private schools, involuntary minority parents implicitly communicate that they trust the intentions of the authority of the school are to meet the academic needs of their children and that the students' interests will be advanced by the assent to the authority of the school. Involuntary minority parents, as other parents, are likely to believe that parochial schools intend for their children to learn and that the learning provided by the school will result in admission to college and/or a satisfying job. This belief held by the involuntary minority parents is transferred both verbally and nonverbally to their children. Thus, both the involuntary minority parents and students develop a sense of trust in the school which allows learning to occur.

Likewise, the academic success of involuntary minority students in Levin's Accelerated schools and Slavin's Success for All programs can be explained as a result of the development of the involuntary minority parents and students' trust in the intentions of the authority of the school and that the students' interests will be advanced by the assent to the authority of the school. Because involuntary minority parents do not necessarily choose to send their children to these schools, the parents do not automatically trust that the school will in any way benefit their children. In fact, involuntary minority parents are likely to distrust these schools since they have traditionally failed to meet the various needs of the involuntary minority students. The schools, therefore, are ultimately responsible for developing a sense of trust in the schools within the involuntary minority community. In both Levin's Accelerated schools and Slavin's Success for All programs, the schools convince the involuntary minority communities to trust in the schools by radically altering the instructional program and/or services offered to the involuntary minority students. Because these schools' intentions are to successfully educate the involuntary minority students and, unlike most schools of involuntary minority students, have taken legitimate and public actions to insure such success, these schools convince the involuntary minority communities to place some level of trust in the school--or at least to suspend their distrust

of the school. Again, this sense of trust, communicated verbally and nonverbally to the parents' children, assists in the development of an environment in which teaching and learning can successfully occur. .

The success of Comer schools and some site-based managed schools can also be explained by the development of the involuntary minority students and parents' trust in the legitimacy of authority and the good intentions of the authority. As Berube (1983; p.156) notes, the King school in Baltimore, with the assistance of Comer and his colleagues, "sought to restore trust and respect and a common educational goal among faculty, students, and parents" through emphasizing a management unit which included parents, teachers, and administrators. In Comer schools, then, the involuntary minority parents are involved in the decision making processes of the school. This, too, is the goal of true site-based managed schools. Since the involuntary minority parents and/or students are partners in the authority of the school, they trust in both the legitimacy of the authority and in the good intentions of the authority. Again, this sense of trust allows learning to occur.

The development of involuntary minority parents and students' trust in the school, then, appears to be an effective explanation of the academic success of involuntary students in a variety of settings in which neither the sociolinguistic nor the cultural-ecological explanations are operable. Since the concept of trust does appear to be a viable explanation for the success and failure of involuntary minority students, this essay proposes that schools must develop and initiate programs, policies, and procedures which attempt to meet the needs of the involuntary minority students in order to develop the involuntary minority community's sense of trust in the school. In this way, schools can ensure the academic achievement of its involuntary minority students.

There is not, however, any specific program of reform which will ensure the development of involuntary minority trust in the school. Each individual school site and the community in which it is embedded are unique in a multitude of ways. An effective approach at one school may prove to be ineffective at another school site. The actual

approach utilized, therefore, is not particularly important. What is important is that the school or reform program generate a suspension of the involuntary minority community's distrust of the school and instigate a feeling of trust in the school. The fact that a variety of disparate schools and school reform programs have proven to be effective in educating involuntary minority students, such as the schools and reform efforts mentioned above, simply reinforces this contention.

Using Erickson's four components of trust relevant to schooling, the focus of the remainder of this essay will be on identifying components within the traditional school structure and environment which cause involuntary minority parents and students to distrust the school while also proposing some strategies to develop a trusting relationship between the school and the involuntary minority community. This discussion, however, is not an exhaustive, prescriptive formula for schools to follow. Each individual school must reflect on its current educational program and its relationship with the involuntary minority community that it serves. Based on this self-reflection, the school must involve the involuntary minority community in deciding which strategies to utilize. The strategies which I will discuss are: increasing parent participation, increasing teacher self-efficacy and expectations, adopting a multicultural curriculum and culturally relevant pedagogy, and creating a curriculum meaningful to all students.

Parent Participation

According to Erickson (1987), a community's sense of trust in the legitimacy of the school authority is dependent upon the relationships and interpersonal contact between the parents and the school staff. The traditional school culture and environment, transmitted by the verbal and nonverbal communication of the school staff, is often perceived as uncaring, unfriendly, and even hostile by involuntary minority parents. As a result, according to Calabrese (1990), involuntary minority parents often passively withdraw from contact with the school. This diminished level of contact between parents and school increases the

negative perceptions of the school held by the parents (Bingham, et al., 1989), hence a cycle of deepening negative perceptions and further withdrawal is enacted. As the distance between parents and school staff increases, communication decreases further, and parents and teachers begin to blame each other for the failure of involuntary minority students (Lightfoot, 1981). Concomitantly, the negative perceptions of the school held by the involuntary minority community are transmitted to the involuntary minority youth in the community (Ogbu, 1991), thus the children possess a negative perception of the school upon their arrival. As the negative perceptions of the school deepen, a sense of distrust of the school develops within the involuntary minority community. The traditional school organization and culture, then, are instrumental factors in the creation of a sense of distrust of the school within the involuntary minority community.

Most involuntary minority parents, contrary to the opinion of some Anglo teachers, are highly concerned about their children's education and are desirous of being involved in the educational process (Brantlinger, 1985). Involuntary minority parents, however, are often excluded, either intentionally or unintentionally, from participation by the school (Cummins, 1986). As Lareau (1987) argues, involuntary minority parents are often the least likely to possess the experience, confidence, and social status necessary for effective participation within the school bureaucracy (Lareau, 1987). Schools, thus, which operate in a bureaucratic manner, often unintentionally exclude involuntary minority parents.

Schools can utilize a variety of strategies to facilitate the involvement of involuntary minority parents in the educational process and, therefore, increase the level of trust in the school held by the involuntary minority community. Three of the most useful strategies are, in my opinion, increasing the constructive communication between the school staff and parents, involving parents in the school's decision making process, and facilitating the development of the parents' abilities to interact with the educational bureaucracy.

Communication In most school organizations, the communication process between the school staff and minority parents is unequivocally unidirectional and negative in nature (Calabrese, 1990). Teachers tend to talk to, not with, involuntary minority parents in addition to eliciting far less input from involuntary minority parents concerning the education of their children than from white, middle-class parents (Sizer, 1984). Such continous negative communication often results in involuntary minority parents becoming increasingly suspicious about the school's abilities and intentions (Calabrese, 1990). This suspicion, or distrust, leads the parents to remove themselves from further interactions with the school. Once parents stop participating, teachers often blame involuntary minority students' academic failure on the lack of parental interest and support. By doing so, teachers absolve themselves of responsibility for the education of many involuntary minority students (Brantlinger, 1985). School staff, therefore, need to consciously endeavor to develop a two-way communication process which is more positive in nature.

In facilitating a more interactive and positive dialogue with parents, the school must recognize and respect the unique needs of many involuntary minority parents. Since many involuntary minority parents do not perceive school invitations as genuine (Brantlinger, 1985), the staff may need to personally contact the parents in addition to involving involuntary minority church and community leaders in an effort to convince involuntary minority parents to visit the school. In addition, since many involuntary minority parents are unable to attend school functions due to child-care and/or work responsibilities, schools may need to provide child-care for parents and collaborate with area businesses to provide flex-time for workers with children. For schools with parents not fluent in English, any communications with the parents should be in the parents' native tongue. Finally, school staff must insure that communications to involuntary minority parents become more positive in nature. Once a positive, open, and mutually respectful communication pattern is established by the school, involuntary minority parents will be more likely to participate in school activities.

Decision Making The involvement of involuntary minority parents in the decision making processes of the school is perhaps the most important method for increasing the trust of involuntary minority parents in the legitimacy of the school authority. Although the effect on student achievement of parental involvement in school decision making is disputed, D'Amico (1980) argues enough evidence exists to conclude that such participation reduces parents' sense of alienation from the school. Unfortunately, however, the majority of parents involved in school decision making are those conforming to and supporting the existing white, middle-class culture of the school; involuntary minority parents, then, are usually excluded (Calabrese, 1988). Underrepresentation of involuntary minority viewpoints is especially true of committees responsible for the development of school policies regarding discipline procedures and other rules and regulations (Calabrese, 1988). Since those embracing the Anglo norms of the school are overly represented on such committees, their decisions often foist the Anglo norms of behavior upon all students while ignoring the cultural norms of behavior of the involuntary minority groups represented within the school (Calabrese, 1990). As a result, involuntary minorities are often disproportionately disciplined by the school staff (Felice, 1981). In his research, Ogbu (1991) found such practices contribute to involuntary minorities sometimes viewing school policies as an imposition of Anglo culture upon involuntary minority students. Likewise, Calabrese (1990) argues the neglect of differing cultural perspectives in the development and implementation of school policies and procedures contributes to the perception by the involuntary minority community of the school as a hostile, discriminatory entity unresponsive to the needs of involuntary minority students. Ultimately, then, involuntary minority parents and students learn to distrust the Anglo school system and perceive it to be fit only for Anglos. Schools, therefore, must ensure involuntary minority students and parents are equitably represented on all school decision making committees, especially on committees responsible for discipline procedures and other school policies.

Schools, however, must be cognizant of the possibility that the simple participation of involuntary minority parents on decision making committees often may not be enough to insure proper representation due to inequities in the committee members' ability to exercise power (Scheurich and Imber, 1991). According to Scheurich and Imber (1991), committees must also insure each member of the group has an equal voice in the decision making process if involuntary minority views are to be equitably and accurately represented.

Teaching Parents to Interact Even when invited to interact with school staff and participate in school decision making, many involuntary minority parents decline because of the belief they lack the personal knowledge and competence to operate within a large bureaucratic system such as a school (Lareau, 1987). In her ethnographic study, Delgado-Gaitan (1988) found the school under study fully expected all parents to participate in their children's schooling, but, according to her, the school never provided the means by which parents could learn how to relate to the school in a positive manner. To believe school personnel would be able to successfully teach involuntary minority parents how to fully participate in the educational process when they have traditionally failed at educating involuntary minority children is naive, at best. The school could, however, contract with the local involuntary minority clergy and/or involuntary minority parents who have successfully interacted with schools to instruct these parents on the intricacies of interacting with the educational bureaucracy. Within this education, parents may need to receive training to become assertive, and also encouraged, to approach the school organization with legitimate demands for equal education (Calabrese, 1988). Since assertive demands made by special education parent advocacy groups have resulted in large advancements in the educational opportunity afforded special education students, involuntary minority parents could perhaps make great strides toward educational equity in this manner also. This is not to say, however, that the school's responsibility is limited to simply helping the parents

learn to interact. Schools must ensure the difference in social status, connections, and power which often exists between Anglo parents and involuntary minority parents is not a relevant factor in determining the school's level of response. The school must respond to the needs and demands of *all* parents equally.

Teacher Self-Efficacy and Expectations

According to Erickson (1987), school success is also contingent upon the development of a sense of trust within the community in the good intentions of the school staff. The strategies described previously are all components in the development of this trust, but the high expectations and attitudes of the teachers towards involuntary minority students are also critical factors. Teachers with high expectations and positive attitudes tend to increase achievement, while teachers with low expectations and negative attitudes tend to decrease the achievement of their students (Good, 1981). Additionally, Miller (1991) found that a teacher's sense of self-efficacy significantly influenced the attitudes and expectations of the teacher about students. Teachers generally hold lower expectations for involuntary minority students (Grant, 1988; Winfield, 1986) and harbor more negative attitudes towards involuntary minority students (Wiley and Eskilson, 1978), often because involuntary minority students do not exhibit white, middle-class behaviors (Winfield, 1986). In fact, according to Wiley and Eskilson (1978), teachers even look for and reinforce academic behaviors in Anglo students more than in African American students and often attribute the success of Anglo students to internal factors while attributing the success of African American students to external factors. These low expectations consistently manifest themselves in the overrepresentation of involuntary minority students in special education, compensatory programs, vocational education, and remedial courses (Goodlad and Oakes, 1988; Oakes, 1986). All of these intervention strategies, implemented in the belief such programs would compensate for the special needs of involuntary minority students, have proved to be ineffective at best, and detrimental at

worst, to the academic achievement of involuntary minority students (Cummins, 1986; Goodlad and Oakes, 1988; Levin, 1991) In effect, the prejudicial foundations of the expectations of teachers and administrators concerning involuntary minority students creates a dual system of education in which the courses taken by white, middle-class students and poor, involuntary minority students vary widely in expectations, teacher enthusiasm, teaching methods, and academic content (Goodlad and Oakes, 1988). As Ogbu (1991) notes, such educational inequities, in combination with the inequities prevalent in the larger society, have produced a belief within the involuntary minority community that neither the dominant Anglo group nor their institutions, including the school, can be trusted.

Detracking An initial step towards creating an equitable educational system is to eliminate the practice of ability grouping. As Adler (1982, p.21) states, "To give the same quality of schooling to all requires a program of study that is . . . one in the same for all." Although many may doubt the efficacy of such an approach, Levin (1991) has shown through his accelerated schools program that all students can benefit from the instructional program and curriculum usually reserved for the more "gifted" students. Schools, therefore, should endeavor to eliminate ability grouping to enhance the achievement of all students, but especially that of involuntary minority students. Reyes and Valencia (1993) caution, however, that schools must also provide additional tutoring and other types of special help if poor, involuntary minority students are to compete with their Anglo peers. The elimination of tracking by the school is likely to convey to the involuntary minority community the intention of the school to provide the resources and assistance necessary for meaningful learning to occur. This expression of good intentions by the school is likely to increase the sense of trust held by the involuntary minority community for the school and school authority.

Teacher Efficacy Although the elimination of ability grouping is an excellent first step, the simple detracking of students without concomitant changes in the expectations of teachers for involuntary minority students will likely result in continued disparities between the achievement of involuntary minority students and Anglo youth. As previously noted, teachers often expect less from involuntary minority students; hence, even in a heterogeneously grouped classroom, involuntary minority students will continue to receive an inferior education. Regrettably, there is a paucity of research on strategies to alter the expectations and beliefs of teachers. Pine and Hilliard (1990), however, conclude that the involvement of preservice teachers in settings in which all children are academically successful is necessary for the development of teachers with a high degree of self-efficacy and high expectations for all students. Unfortunately, better undergraduate preparation of teachers would not assist schools in altering the attitudes of teachers already employed. For those teachers already in the profession, staff development addressing the racial and cultural aspects of education is imperative (Pine and Hilliard, 1990). A short, superficial treatment of the subject, however, would be unlikely to have any lasting effect on the attitudes of teachers.

Perhaps a more promising effort for the individual school site is to attempt to increase the sense of self-efficacy of teachers. As noted previously, Miller (1991) found teachers with a high sense of self-efficacy also possess high expectations for students. If schools, thus, can increase the self-efficacy of teachers, they can also raise the expectations of teachers for students. Changing the pedagogical skills of teachers, however, is a prerequisite for increasing teachers' sense of self-efficacy according to Miller (1991). She proposes teachers need successful experiences with involuntary minority students to establish and fortify the belief their competence made the difference, not any external factors such as the home background of the student. Teachers, then, need evidence which unequivocally demonstrates the relationship between their efforts and the achievement shown by students. Miller (1991) suggests teachers and their supervisors can jointly

develop realistic and specific goals related to the development of new teaching behaviors by utilizing the literature on effective teaching practices. The supervisor can then validate the building of new skills and the effects of those new skills on student performance by providing continuous support and feedback. The validation provided by the supervisor, assuming that he/she is viewed as credible, will enhance the feelings of self-efficacy and self-awareness of the teacher. Additionally, peer coaching, modeling, problem solving with case studies, videos of experts, role playing, and the support of special personnel are strategies which may also prove useful in the teacher's development (Miller, 1991). Although there does not exist any empirical evidence to support Miller's proposal, her findings that high-efficacy teachers are able to articulate different teaching strategies and personal accounts of success with low-achieving students more so than low-efficacy teachers lends credence to her argument. Once teachers possess a wide variety of teaching skills and the belief that all children are capable of learning, then involuntary minority students will begin to receive a more equitable education.

Multicultural Curriculum and Culturally Relevant Pedagogy

Erickson's (1987, p.15) third component of trust necessary for learning is, "trust that one's own identity will be maintained positively in relation to authority." Throughout the last century, however, American schools have sought to reshape immigrant and involuntary minority students into white, middle-class citizens (Tyack, 1974), often by ignoring the cultural heritage of the students and presenting a monocultural perspective throughout the curriculum (Pine and Hilliard, 1990). Since the school curriculum was more consistent with white, middle-class culture than for other groups of students, these students tended to find the school a more comfortable place to exist than involuntary minority and poor students (Banks, 1993). Additionally, involuntary minority students have been denied the acquisition of knowledge about their cultural heritage and cultural contributions to American society necessary to the organized development of their cultural

identity (Gay, 1990; Pine and Hilliard, 1990). Schools have, therefore, traditionally stripped immigrants and involuntary minorities of their self-identity. According to Gay (1990), the methods utilized by schools to "Americanize" students have been both overt, such as utilizing an Anglocentric curriculum, and the covert, such as basing school norms and culture on Anglo-Saxon, Protestant beliefs of appropriate behavior. Schools, thus, can assist involuntary minority students in retaining their cultural identity while also developing their intellectual capabilities by implementing school policies and procedures sensitive to the various cultures within the school, adopting a multicultural curriculum, and utilizing culturally relevant pedagogy.

Multicultural Curriculum The curriculum of schools in the United States has traditionally been controlled by Anglo males (Tyack, 1974). Hence, most of what has been taught in the public schools has focused on western civilization and has been based on the assumption of the supremacy and universal nature of the male, Anglo-Saxon experience (Banks, 1993; Gay, 1990; Pine and Hilliard, 1990). Since the sixties, advocates for multicultural education have proposed schools adopt a more pluralistic perspective for their curriculum (McCarthy, 1988). As Grant (1988) notes, however, little progress has been made over the last quarter-century in addressing racial and cultural diversity in a meaningful way. Many schools have simply adopted a "heroes and holidays" approach in an attempt to provide a more pluralistic perspective within the curriculum. Celebrating African Americans during Black history month or eating Mexican food during Cinco de Mayo, however, simply trivializes ethnic cultures (Pine and Hilliard, 1990) and only reinforces the notion of involuntary minorities as second-class citizens (Gay, 1990). Additionally, Banks (1993, pg. 11) notes that studies reveal textbooks continue to, "reinforce the dominant social, economic, and power arrangements within society." A multicultural perspective must permeate all aspects of the curriculum to be truly effective (Gay, 1990; Grant, 1990). In fact, Gay (1990, pg. 58) concludes that only when the curriculum is infused throughout

with a multicultural perspective will students, "achieve academic excellence without jeopardizing their personal identity or cultural integrity."

Multicultural education, however, possesses quite disparate connotations among the education community (Grant and Sleeter, 1986). In reviewing a number of multicultural education programs, Grant and Sleeter (1986) have identified five different approaches. The Teaching the Culturally Different approach attempts to help oppressed groups assimilate into society as it currently exists by utilizing students' learning styles, culturally relevant materials, and the use of students' native language. The Humans Relations Approach attempts to develop positive relationships between members of diverse groups. Single-Group studies addresses the oppression of only a single group. The Multicultural approach reconfigures the entire process of education to promote equality and cultural pluralism. The Multicultural and Social Reconstructionist approach builds on the previous approaches and attempts to teach students to analyze inequality and oppression in society and to develop the social action skills of the students.

Grant and Sleeter (1986) contend that the Multicultural and Social Reconstructionist approach is most appropriate since it treats the ideals of democracy and equality most seriously. Within this approach, Grant and Sleeter (1986) propose six recommendations for an educational program which is Multicultural and Social Reconstructionist. First, students should be provided the opportunity to become actively involved in their learning. Second, students should become aware of the importance and significance the role of groups play in shaping the lives of individuals. Third, students should become aware of the extent of the inequitable distribution of resources and how it impacts the lives of individuals. Fourth, all students need to receive equal access to the best resources, such as skilled teachers, high expectations, curricular topics, physical resources, and so forth. Fifth, students need to develop an appreciation of their own and other groups. And sixth, students should learn to analyze and act on social issues. This approach, according to

Grant and Sleeter (1986), is necessary to improve the human condition of those oppressed because of their race, ethnicity, gender, or social class.

Culturally Relevant Pedagogy The infusion of multicultural perspectives throughout the curriculum, however, is only part of the solution. Gay (1990, p.59) credits Cuban as describing the process of adopting a multicultural curriculum without concomitantly changing teaching styles as, "grafting ethnic content onto white instruction." Since such an approach is usually ineffective (Gay, 1990), teachers must utilize a variety of instructional methods in order to accommodate the discontinuity in learning styles between the home and school (Delgado-Gaitan, 1987). As Erickson (1987, p.30) argues, one method to maintain the trust of the students, at least in the earlier grades, is to, "adapt instruction in the direction of the students' home cultural communication style." In addition, teachers must also possess an understanding of the different cultural backgrounds of the students to escape from inadvertently creating a discriminatory classroom environment.

The traditional teaching methodologies and classroom culture are, more often than not, based on the needs and preferences of the Anglo students within the classroom. These practices, according to Pine and Hilliard (1990, pg. 598), "have often proved to be dysfunctional and anachronistic [for non-Anglo students] . . . [they are] rigid, uncreative, and characterized by low expectations." Mainstream Anglo students, thus, perform quite well in the traditional classroom setting. These students are comfortable in a competitive environment where there is little teacher-student interaction, material is presented visually, and the use of standard English is emphasized, (Bennett, 1979; Briscoe, 1991; Franklin, 1992). Alternatively, involuntary minority students fare poorly within the traditional classroom setting in comparison to Anglo students. Although each individual student possesses unique learning styles and classroom environmental preferences, there are some commonalties between African American and Hispanic American students (Briscoe, 1991). Involuntary minority students are more comfortable in a cooperative environment where

there is a high degree of teacher-student interaction, material is presented both visually and orally, and content is emphasized over the correct standard English usage (Bennett, 1979; Briscoe, 1991; Franklin, 1992).

The differences in learning styles and classroom environmental preferences between Anglo and minority students suggest several salient strategies schools can implement in order to decrease the discontinuity between home and school. First, and foremost, the school staff must become cognizant of the cultural differences between Anglo and involuntary minority students (Delgado-Gaitan, 1987). To ignore these differences is to diminish the opportunity to engage involuntary minority students in the classroom. When teachers are aware and accepting of the differences between students, they are more likely to create a caring environment in which all students can succeed. Second, teachers and administrators need to learn the culture of the community and how to build on the cultural strengths of the students (Delgado-Gaitan, 1987). Third, teachers need to employ small group activities, peer tutoring, and cooperative learning when working with all students, but with involuntary minority students especially (Bennett, 1979; Briscoe, 1991; Franklin, 1992). Fourth, teachers need to present information visually, orally, and tactually to address the different learning styles dispersed among students of all ethnicities. Finally, teachers need to focus on content more than on the correct use of standard English. As Erickson(1987) notes, Piestrup (1973) found that students are more likely to develop their cognitive skills and learn standard English when the teachers does not sanction students for their use of non-standard English. In the earlier grades, thus, a "whole-language" approach could be implemented while a substance-over-style approach could be adopted in later grades.

Meaningful Curriculum

The final component of trust necessary for learning, according to Erickson (1987, p.15), is, "[the] trust that one's own interests will be advanced by compliance with the

exercise of authority." In regard to schooling, the ultimate interest of most parents and students of all ethnicities is for their children to use their public education as a means to acquire a rewarding occupation or profession (Levin, 1985). For many students, the majority of whom are white and middle or upper-class, this interest is often advanced by the school (Sizer, 1984). For many of the poor and involuntary minority students, however, the Anglo power structure has erected societal barriers which deny them equal opportunity in schooling and employment (Ogbu, 1991). The most salient barrier for many involuntary minorities is the discrimination within the labor market. Involuntary minority responses to these barriers include both conflict with and mistrust of the dominant Anglo society in addition to the development of a culture in opposition to the Anglo culture (Ogbu, 1991: Fordham and Ogbu, 1986). Within the school setting, this oppositional culture is manifested in an anti-academic orientation or counter-school culture for many involuntary minority students (Fordham and Ogbu, 1986). As Adler (1982) states, "Hopelessness about the future is bound to affect the motivation in school. Why do the hard work that good basic schooling would demand if, after doing it, no opportunity exists to work for a decent living?" Involuntary minority students, hence, often respond to the perceived hopelessness of their situation by dropping-out, passively withdrawing, or actively resisting the schooling process (Calabrese, 1988). Regardless of the response, precious little academic learning takes place. The school often blames the involuntary minority community for the problems arising from the involuntary minority students' oppositional culture while the involuntary minority community blames the school for failing to educate their children (Berube, 1983; Pine and Hilliard, 1990).

How, then, can schools convince involuntary minority students to actively participate in the educational process ? According to Levin (1985), students for whom the school-employment link has been severed will engage in learning only if they believe education has a payoff for them or they enjoy learning. Schools have a choice then: alter the perception of the payoff of education, teach students in a manner which is exciting and

meaningful to them, or both. Irrespective of the choice, the involuntary minority community's sense of trust in the school would be enhanced since the school would be perceived as advancing the interests of involuntary minority students.

The Payoff of Education As Felice (1981) observes, many researchers have replicated the finding that the number of years of education completed is the primary determinant of occupational mobility and success for all ethnicities. The number of African American students applying to colleges, meanwhile, is declining (Welch, et al., 1989). Because fewer African Americans (and Hispanic Americans) are entering and completing college, fewer involuntary minorities will acquire the education necessary to obtain high status, lucrative employment. Although discrimination in the labor market still exists, those involuntary minorities with college degrees from reputable institutions are finding employment. Therefore, if the public schools can adequately prepare involuntary minority students and encourage them to seek higher education, there will be a payoff to their education. But, as Welch, et al. (1989) note, the unfamiliarity of involuntary minority students with the college experience is one of the reasons for the overall decline in minority college enrollment. As a female, African American freshman at the University of Texas at Austin related, "I never even dreamed of going to a college like [the University of] Texas until my math teacher took us [a group of minority students] to different college campuses, involved us in summer college programs, and assigned us to fill out college applications as homework." If schools can familiarize involuntary minority students with the college experience early in their schooling and ensure these students are aware of the available college funding, then the school can increase the number of its involuntary minority students who continue their education up to and through college. Since the number of years of schooling is linked to job mobility and success, the involuntary minority community would perceive the school as advancing the involuntary minority community's

interest of obtaining better employment for involuntary minorities. Trust in the school, hence, would emerge within the involuntary minority community.

Schools can prepare their involuntary minority students for the college experience in a number of ways. In the successful Excel program developed by Welch and her colleagues, involuntary minority students' chances for college enrollment and success are enhanced in three ways: first, the students are enrolled in a strong precollege program emphasizing reading, writing, and foreign language skills; second, the college experience is demystified for the students through college visits and first-hand experiences with college lectures, seminars, and assignments given by local college faculty; and third, the students are provided assistance in developing career paths by involving them in goal setting and investigation of various career options (Welch, et al., 1989). Schools can also strive to place involuntary minority students in the many summer college programs for involuntary minority youth and match involuntary minority students with successful involuntary minority mentors to serve as role models. Encouragement to take college entrance examinations and assistance in completing college applications may also be necessary. Regardless of the approach developed at the local school site, success in increasing the involuntary minority college enrollment from the school is likely to increase the level of trust involuntary minority students and parents place in the school.

Meaningful Education As noted earlier, schools can also develop a sense of trust within the involuntary minority community by teaching students in a manner which is exciting and meaningful to the students. When chronically tardy or truant students are asked to explain their behavior, most respond by saying that school is too boring, rather than that it is too difficult(Glasser, 1990). Even the "successful" students planning to attend college often describe school as boring and irrelevant, but succeed in school because they see college and a satisfying job as a reward for enduring high school (Sizer, 1984). The most common explanations for the boredom experienced by so many students in middle and high school

are that the curriculum presented and the work required are too trivial and the participation by students in the educational process is too limited (Sizer, 1984; Glasser, 1990). As Glasser (1990) observes, students either passively or actively resist schooling because of the "low-quality, standardized, fragmented approach" of the regular curriculum. In addition, Sizer (1984) remarks that the curriculum has become far too bland to interest most students. Moreover, the lack of involvement in the the content and management of a class allows students to be passive, rather than active, participants in their schooling (Glasser, 1990). Thus, as long as the curriculum is perceived as boring, the work required is deemed "busy work", and students are not active participants within the classroom, involuntary minority students will continue to distrust the school because they believe school holds no meaning for them. To create a meaningful education for all students, then, will require a fundamental change in what is taught, how it is taught, and the role of the student in the process.

Although the specifics of a meaningful curriculum for the students of an individual school must be decided by the school staff, parents, and students at that particular school site, the curriculum will not be construed as meaningful if it continues to emphasize facts and right answers rather than causes and the thinking process (Glasser, 1990). Schools must decide what are the truly essential components of the existing curriculum, then provide more depth to those topics (Sizer, 1984). Likewise, Glasser (1990) proposes that it is the quality, not the quantity, of the topics offered which engages students in the learning process. In addition, the curriculum must not focus solely on those topics which prepare students for college or employment, but must also seek to teach those topics which will assist students in living well (Adler, 1982). Schools must teach students to become good, decent citizens and to be lifelong learners if they are to lead fruitful lives (Sizer, 1984). Schools, thus, should offer fewer, more in-depth topics which concern not only employment, but living the life of a decent, caring human being as well if the school is to become worthwhile to students of all ethnicities.

As noted earlier, the manner in which topics are taught must also change. In addition, assignments for students must change. In most schools, meaningless busy work prevails (Glasser, 1990). Assignments must not focus on the memorization of trivial facts or the regurgitation of useless information, but must truly challenge the thinking of the students. Since, according to Sizer (1984), all people enjoy meeting a challenge, students will enjoy completing challenging work. Teachers, however, must not overshoot the abilities of the students. To do so would only cause students to stop trying. Teachers must explain and discuss their expectations of quality work and provide quality examples for students to inspect. Most importantly, students need to be involved in assessing the quality of what they produce. In this way, students will discover how to perform quality work (Glasser, 1990).

Finally, students must become involved in the decisions made about the content and the management of the class (Glasser, 1990; Sizer, 1984). Glasser (1990) contends everyone has a need for power and freedom. When a person's power is not recognized and sought and their freedom restricted, that person has little self-esteem (Sizer, 1984). When this occurs in the typical classroom, a state of "happy dependence" develops in which students are asked to do little and students respond by risking little (Sizer, 1984). When schools and teachers do ask students to participate in decision making and truly listen to the students, then the students' need for power is satisfied (Glasser, 1990). As a result, their personal esteem is enhanced and they are more likely to take risks in their attempt to complete meaningful, quality work. This does not mean, however, that the teacher is not the person in charge, but only that the teacher does not make power an issue when they manage their classroom (Glasser, 1990). The involvement of students in the educational process, then, is necessary for schooling to become meaningful to students.

Conclusion

Trust, as this essay has shown, is a critical variable influencing the achievement of involuntary minority students. When a school initiates and implements programs, policies, and procedures with the express intention of seriously meeting the needs of the involuntary minority students, then the school can begin to forge an environment in which the involuntary monority community can begin to rightfully place trust in the local school and its staff. In such an atmosphere, effective teaching and learning can take place and, subsequently, involuntary minority academic achievement will improve. The components of trust which must be developed within the involuntary minority community include trust in the legitimacy of the authority of the school, trust in the good intentions of the school staff, trust that one's own identity can be maintained in relation to the authority of the school, and trust that one's own interests will be advanced through compliance with the exercise of authority. If the educational achievement of involuntary minority and Anglo students is ever going to be equalized, schools must endeavor to develop a mutually trusting relationship with the involuntary minority community. And once this trusting relationship is changed, it must be treated as an inviolate by the school because trust cannot be turned on and off as a spigot. With this caveat in mind, a number of viable strategies schools can use to develop a trusting relationship with the involuntary minority community have been proposed in this essay. Since each school and school community is unique, however, each school will need to modify these strategies according to its unique needs. To determine the strategies appropriate to its situation, all schools must begin to analyze how their long-standing traditions, school policies, norms of behavior, and culture contribute to the alienation of involuntary minority parents and students from the school and the subsequent development of distrust. All staff members must personally reflect on how their beliefs about students' family backgrounds, ethnicities, cultural behaviors, and self-conceptions influence their own expectations and behaviors towards the students. This will require a considerable amount of dialogue within the school community about what

equality means, what practices deny equal access, and what practices promote it. It is absolutely imperative the principal and staff include parents and students of all ethnicities and social classes in this discussion.

Although this essay has focused on the school site as the center of change, this does not imply that changes in other areas are not necessary. School districts must also change and must become highly supportive of individual schools wanting to change. Likewise, state education agencies and state legislatures must provide the necessary resources and encouragement for all schools, especially those in urban areas, to meet the needs of the involuntary minority communities. In addition, since schools exist within the context of the larger society, society must concomitantly begin to change also. Schools can become the starting point for this reformation by initiating a discourse on the purpose of schooling, the role of racism and prejudice in the schooling process and in society, and the need for educational equity for all students within the school and within the community it is charged to serve.

REFERENCES

Adler, Mortimer (1982). The Paideia Proposal. New York, MacMillan Publishers

Banks, James A. (1993). "The Canon Debate, Knowledge Construction, and Multicultural Education." *Educational Researcher*, V22, n5, pp. 4-14

Bennett, Christine (1979). "Teaching Students as They Would Be Taught." *Educational Leadership*, V36, n4, pp. 259-268

Berube, Maurice R. (1983). "Educating the Urban Poor." *The Urban Review*, V15, n3, pp.151-163

Bingham, Richard D., Haubrich, Paul A., and White, Sammis B. (1989). "Determinants of Parent Attitudes About Schools and the School System." *Urban Education*, V23, n4, pp. 348-360

Brantlinger, Ellen (1985). "Low-Income Parents' Perceptions of Favoritism in the Schools." *Urban Education*, V20, n1, pp. 82-101

Briscoe, Diane Buck (1991). Designing for Diversity in School Success: Capitalizing on Culture." *Preventing School Failure*, V36, n1, pp. 13-18

Calabrese, Raymond L. (1990). "The Public School: A Source of Alienation for Minority Parents." *Journal of Negro Education*, V59, n2, pp. 148-154

Calabrese, Raymond L. (1988). "The Structure of Schooling and Minority Drop-Out Rates." *The Clearing House*, V61, n7, pp. 325-328

Comer, James P. (1988). "Educating Poor Minority Children." *The Scientific American.*, V259, n5, pp. 42-48

Cummins, Jim (1986). "Empowering Minority Students: A Framework For Intervention." *Harvard Educational Review*, V56, n1, pp. 18-36

D'Amico, Joseph (1980). "Reviving Student Participation." Educational Leadership, V38, n1, pp. 38-46

Delgado-Gaitan, Concha (1987). "Traditions and Transitions in the Learning Process of Mexican Children: An Ethnographic View." In Spindler, George and Louise (Eds.) Interpretive Ethnography of Education: At Home and Abroad. Hillsdale, N.J.; Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers

Delgado-Gaitan, Concha (1988). "The Value of Conformity: Learning to Stay in School." *Anthropology and Education Quarterly*, V19, n4, pp. 256-281

Erickson, Frederick (1987). "Transformation and School Success: The Politics and Culture of Educational Achievement." Paper to be published in *Education and Anthropology Quarterly*, V18, n4

Felice, Lawrence (1981). "Black Student Dropout Behavior: Disengagement from School Rejection and Racial Discrimination." *The Journal of Negro Education*, V50,n4, pp.415-424

Fine, Michelle (1986). "Why Urban Adolescents Drop Into and Out of Public High School." *Teachers College Review*, V87, n3, pp. 393-409

Fordham, Signithia and Ogbu, John (1986). "Black Students' School Success: Coping with the Burden of 'Acting White.'" *The Urban Review*, V18, pp. 176-206

Franklin, Mary E. (1992). "Culturally Sensitive Instructional Practices for African-American Learners with Disabilities." *Exceptional Children*, V59, n2, pp. 115-122

Gay, Geneva (1990). "Achieving Educational Equality Through Curriculum Desegregation." *Phi Delta Kappan*, V72, n1, pp. 56-62

Glasser, William (1990). The Quality School. New York, Harper Perennial Publishers

Good, Thomas, L. (1981). "Teacher Expectations and Student Perceptions: A Decade of Research." *Educational Leadership*, V38, n5, pp. 415-422

Goodlad, John and Oakes, Jeannie (1988). "We Must Offer Equal Access to Knowledge." *Educational Leadership*, V45, n5, pp. 16-22

Grant, Carl A. (1988). "The Persistent Significance of Race in Schooling." *The Elementary School Journal*, V88, n5, pp.561-570

Grant, Carl A. and Sleeter, Christine, E. (1986). "Educational Equity: Education that is Multicultural and Reconstructionist." *Journal of Educational Equity and Leadership*, V6, n2, pp. 105-118

Lareau, Annette (1987). "Family-School Relationships: The Importance of Cultural Capital." *Sociology of Education*, V60, pp. 73-85

Levin, Henry M. and Hopfenberg, Wendy S. (1991). "Accelerated Schools for At-Risk Students." *Education Digest*, V56, n9, pp. 47-51

Levin, Henry M. (1985). "Education and Jobs: The Weak Link." In Gross, Beatrice and Gross, Ronald (Eds.) The Great School Debate. New York, Simon and Schuster

Lightfoot, Sara Lawrence (1982). "Toward Conflict Resolution: Relationship Between Families and Schools." *Theory Into Practice*, V20, n2, pp. 97-104

McCarthy, Cameron (1988). "Rethinking Liberal and Racial Perspectives on Racial Inequality in Schooling: Making a Case for Nonsynchrony." *Harvard Educational Review*, V.58, n3, pp. 255-278

Miller, Patricia S. (1991). "Increasing Teacher Efficacy With At-Risk Students." *Equity and Excellence*, V25, n1, pp. 30-36

Oakes, Jeannie (1986). "Tracking, Inequality and the Rhetoric of Reform: Why Schools Don't Change." *Journal of Education*, V168, n1, pp. 60-80

Ogbu, John (1992). Foreword to Schooling, Jobs, and Cultural Identity. Kahn, Linda (author)

Ogbu, John (1991). "Immigrant and Involuntary Minority in Comparative Perspective." In Gibson, M. and Ogbu, J. (Eds.) Minority Status and Schooling: A Comparative Study of Immigrant and Involuntary Minorities. New York, Garland Publishers.

Ogbu, John (1987). "Variability in Minority School Performance: A Problem in Search of an Explanation." *Anthropology and Education Quarterly*, V18, pp. 312-334

Pine, Gerald J. and Hilliard, Asa G. (1990). "Rx for Racism: Imperatives for America's Schools." *Phi Delta Kappan*, V71, n1, 593-600

Ravitch, Diane (1983). The Troubled Crusade: American Education 1945-1980. New York,Basic Books, Inc.

Reyes, Pedro and Valencia, Richard R. (1993). "Educational Policy and the Growing Latino Population: Problems and Prospects." *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences*, V15, n2, pp. 258-283

Scheurich, James Joseph and Imber, Michael (1991). "Educational Reforms Can Reproduce Societal Inequities: A Case Study." *Educational Administration Quarterly*, V27, n3, pp. 297-320

Sizer, Theodore R. (1984). Horace's Compromise-The Dilemma of the American High School. Boston, Houghton-Mifflin

Trueba, Henry T. (1988). "Compassion and Equity: Towards an Integration of Cultural Values in Minority Education." Paper presented to the Holmes Group Meeting, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan, September 25-26, 1988

Tyack, David B. (1974). The One Best System. Cambridge, Massachusetts, Harvard University Press

Welch, Olga M., Hodges, Carolyn, and Warden, Kathleen (1989). "Developing the Scholarly Ethos in Minority High School Students." *Urban Education*, V24, n1, pp. 59-76

Wiley, Martha and Eskilson, Arlene (1978). "Why Did You Learn in School Today? Teachers' Perceptions of Causality." *Sociology of Education*, V51, pp. 261-269

Winfield, Linda F. (1986). "Teacher Beliefs Toward Academically At-Risk Students." *The Urban Review*, V.18, n4, pp. 253-267

Villegas, Ana Marie (1988). "School Failure and Cultural Mismatch: Another View." *The Urban Review*, V 20, n4, pp. 253-265